

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 CONVOYANT LLC,

CASE NO. C21-0310JLR

11 Plaintiff,

ORDER CERTIFYING
QUESTION

12 v.

13 DEEPTHINK, LLC,

14 Defendant.

15 **I. INTRODUCTION**

16 Before the court are the supplemental briefs filed by Defendant DeepThink, LLC
17 ("DeepThink") and Plaintiff Convoyant LLC ("Convoyant") in response to the court's
18 December 7, 2021 order. (DeepThink Supp. (Dkt. # 26); Convoyant Supp. (Dkt. # 27);
19 12/07/21 Order (Dkt. # 25).) In those briefs, the parties respond to the court's proposal to
20 certify to the Washington Supreme Court the question of what approach to apply when
21 analyzing preemption under the Washington Uniform Trade Secrets Act, ch. 19.108
22 RCW ("WUTSA"). (*See* 12/07/21 Order at 19.) The parties agree that the court should

1 certify the question. (*See* DeepThink Supp.; Convoyant Supp.) Accordingly, for the
2 reasons set forth below, the court CERTIFIES the question; DENIES without prejudice
3 DeepThink's motion for partial summary judgment on Convoyant's tort and unfair
4 competition claims (*see* MPSJ (Dkt. # 15)); and STAYS this matter until the Washington
5 Supreme Court issues its final decision on the certified question.

6 **II. BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS**

7 The procedural history and factual background of this case are set forth in detail in
8 the court's December 7, 2021 order. (*See* 12/07/21 Order at 2-7.) As the court explained
9 in that order, Convoyant alleges fifteen claims arising from DeepThink's alleged practice
10 of scraping data from its ResNexus website. (*See generally* Compl. (Dkt. # 1).) Relevant
11 to the instant order, Convoyant alleges tort claims against DeepThink under both
12 Washington and Utah common law for civil conspiracy (*id.* ¶¶ 106-12), tortious
13 interference with contract and/or business expectancy (*id.* ¶¶ 121-28), trespass to chattels
14 (*id.* ¶¶ 138-45), and unjust enrichment (*id.* ¶¶ 146-53). It also alleges unfair competition
15 claims under the Washington Consumer Protection Act ("WCPA"), ch. 19.86 RCW (*id.*
16 ¶¶ 129-33), and the Utah Unfair Competition Act ("UUCA"), Utah Code § 13-5A-101, *et
seq.* (*id.* ¶¶ 134-37). Finally, it alleges trade secrets claims under the WUTSA (*id.* ¶¶
17 113-16) and the Utah Uniform Trade Secrets Act ("UUTSA"), Utah Code § 13-24, *et seq.*
18 (*id.* ¶¶ 117-20). DeepThink answered the complaint and asserted affirmative defenses.
19 (Ans. (Dkt. # 8).)

1 DeepThink then moved for partial summary judgment. (*See* MPSJ.) In relevant
 2 part, DeepThink asserted that the WUTSA and UUTSA preempt Convoyant's tort and
 3 unfair competition claims. (MPSJ at 8-11.) The Washington and Utah enactments of the
 4 Uniform Trade Secrets Act ("UTSA") provide that the UTSA "displaces conflicting tort,
 5 restitutionary, and other law of this state pertaining to civil liability for misappropriation
 6 of a trade secret." RCW 19.108.900(1); Utah Code § 13-24-8. The UTSA does not,
 7 however, displace "[c]ontractual or other civil liability or relief that is not based upon
 8 misappropriation of a trade secret." RCW 19.108.900(2)(a); Utah Code § 13-24-8. Thus,
 9 in both Washington and Utah, when a plaintiff raises a civil claim alongside a UTSA
 10 claim, the court must determine whether the UTSA preempts the civil claim.

11 Both parties urged the court to apply a "fact-based" approach to analyzing UTSA
 12 preemption. (MPSJ at 9; MPSJ Resp. (Dkt. # 17) at 18.) Under this approach, courts
 13 "(1) assess the facts that support the plaintiff's civil claim; (2) ask whether those facts are
 14 the same as those that support the plaintiff's UTSA claim; and (3) hold that the UTSA
 15 preempts liability on the civil claim unless the common law claim is factually
 16 independent from the UTSA claim." *Thola v. Henschell*, 164 P.3d 524, 530 (Wash. Ct.
 17 App. 2007); *see also CDC Restoration & Constr., LC v. Tradesmen Contractors, LLC*,
 18 274 P.3d 317, 331 (Utah Ct. App. 2012). As this court recognized in *Bombardier, Inc. v.*
 19 *Mitsubishi Aircraft Corp.*, however, "'the preemptive scope of the UTSA is an unsettled
 20 issue in Washington.'" 383 F. Supp. 3d 1169, 1195 (W.D. Wash. 2019) (quoting *Inteum*
 21 *Co., LLC v. Nat'l Univ. of Singapore*, No. C17-1252JCC, 2018 WL 2317606, at *2 (W.D.
 22 Wash. May 22, 2018)). Indeed, two recent Washington Court of Appeals decisions had

1 declined to apply *Thola*'s fact-based approach in determining whether tort claims were
 2 preempted by the WUTSA. *See id.* at 1195-96 (citing *SEIU Healthcare Nw. Training*
 3 *P'Ship v. Evergreen Freedom Found.*, 427 P.3d 688, 693-94 (Wash. Ct. App. 2018), *rev.*
 4 *denied*, 435 P.3d 279 (Wash. 2019), and *Modumetal, Inc. v. Xtalic Corp.*, 425 P.3d 871,
 5 883 (Wash. Ct. App. 2018), *rev. denied*, 432 P.3d 793 (Wash. 2019)). These cases held,
 6 instead, that the “leading case” in Washington regarding the preemptive scope of the
 7 WUTSA is *Boeing Co. v. Sierracin Corp.*, 738 P.2d 665, 674 (Wash. 1987), which
 8 applied an “elements-based” approach to preemption. *See id.* (citing *SEIU Healthcare*,
 9 427 P.3d at 694). Under the elements-based approach, “a common law claim is not
 10 preempted if the elements require some allegation or factual showing beyond those
 11 required under the UTSA.” *SEIU Healthcare*, 427 P.3d at 694. The Court of Appeals
 12 determined that because the Washington Supreme Court had not overruled *Boeing*, the
 13 *Thola* fact-based test does not govern the analysis of whether a claim is preempted by the
 14 WUTSA. *SEIU Healthcare*, 427 P.3d at 695. Accordingly, this court observed that

15 Although courts in this district have applied factual preemption, that is only
 16 because “the court’s best prediction w[as] that the Washington Supreme
 17 Court would embrace [Thola’s] view . . . if it were called upon to make a
 18 choice between those views.” *T-Mobile USA [v. Huawei Device USA, Inc.]*,
 19 115 F. Supp. 3d [1184,] 1199 [W.D. Wash. 2015]. *SEIU Healthcare* clarifies
 20 that the Washington Supreme Court has made a choice between those views,
 21 and it is not up to this court to overrule that choice.

22 *Bombardier*, 383 F. Supp. 3d at 1196; *see also Inteum Co., LLC, v. Nat'l Univ. of*
 23 *Singapore*, 371 F. Supp. 3d 864, 871-72 (W.D. Wash. 2019) (holding that *Boeing*, rather
 24 than *Thola*, governed the preemption inquiry).

1 Although it may be unsettled in Washington whether courts should apply the fact-
 2 based or element-based approach in determining WUTSA preemption, there does not
 3 appear to be a dispute in Utah courts that the fact-based approach applies to the UUTSA
 4 preemption analysis. *See, e.g., CDC Restoration & Constr.*, 274 P.3d at 331; *Smart*
 5 *Surgical, Inc. v. Utah Cord Bank, Inc.*, No. 2:20-CV-00244-JNP, 2021 WL 734954, at *4
 6 (D. Utah Feb. 25, 2021). Indeed, the fact-based approach is the majority view across
 7 jurisdictions. *See, e.g., BlueEarth Biofuels, LLC v. Hawaiian Elec. Co., Inc.*, 235 P.3d
 8 310, 316-19 (Haw. 2010) (answering certified question and holding that fact-based
 9 approach applies to Hawaii Uniform Trade Secrets Act). Applying two different tests to
 10 determine whether Convoyant’s Washington and Utah claims are preempted by the
 11 UTSA—tests that may very well yield different results¹—is contrary to the uniformity
 12 goals of the UTSA. *See* RCW 19.108.910 (“This chapter shall be applied and construed
 13 to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law with respect to the subject of
 14 this chapter among states enacting it.”); Utah Code § 13-24-9 (same). Accordingly, the
 15 court seeks guidance from the Washington Supreme Court regarding whether it should
 16 apply the element-based approach as directed by *SEIU Healthcare* or the fact-based

17

18 ¹ Compare, e.g., *Int'l Paper Co. v. Stuit*, No. C11-2139JLR, 2012 WL 1857143, at *6
 19 (W.D. Wash. May 21, 2012) (applying fact-based approach and finding tortious interference
 20 claim preempted because plaintiffs could not establish one of the elements of the claim absent
 21 the allegation that defendants wrongfully used trade secrets), *with LaFrance Corp. v.*
Werttemberger, No. C07-1932Z, 2008 WL 5068653, at *7-*8 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 24, 2008)
 22 (applying elements-based approach and finding conspiracy claim was not preempted because
 “conspiracy requires an element in addition to that required to make out a UTSA cause of
 action”); *see also T-Mobile*, 115 F. Supp. 3d at 1198-99 (applying the fact-based approach to
 dismiss plaintiff’s tortious interference claim and noting that the claim would have survived
 under the elements-based approach).

1 approach endorsed in the majority of jurisdictions in determining whether a claim is
 2 preempted by the WUTSA.

3 Under RCW 2.60.020, “[w]hen in the opinion of any federal court before whom a
 4 proceeding is pending, it is necessary to ascertain the local law of this state in order to
 5 dispose of such proceeding and the local law has not been clearly determined, such
 6 federal court may certify to the supreme court for answer the question of local law
 7 involved and the supreme court shall render its opinion in answer thereto.” The
 8 certification process serves the important judicial interests of efficiency and comity: as
 9 noted by the United States Supreme Court, certification saves “time, energy and
 10 resources and helps build a cooperative judicial federalism.” *Lehman Bros. v. Schein*,
 11 416 U.S. 386, 391 (1974). Here, for the reasons explained above, the court finds that (1)
 12 Washington law remains unsettled regarding the standard to apply when determining
 13 whether the WUTSA preempts tort and statutory unfair competition claims and (2) a
 14 determination of local law is necessary to dispose of this proceeding. Accordingly,
 15 having considered the parties’ supplemental briefs, the record before the court, and the
 16 governing law, the court CERTIFIES the following question pursuant to RCW 2.60.020:

17 When analyzing whether a claim is preempted by the Washington Uniform
 18 Trade Secrets Act, ch. 19.108 RCW, should courts apply the “fact-based”
 19 approach set forth in *Thola v. Henschell*, 164 P.3d 524 (Wash. Ct. App.
 20 2007), or the “elements-based” approach endorsed in *SEIU Healthcare
 Northwest Training Partnership v. Evergreen Freedom Foundation*, 427
 21 P.3d 688 (Wash. Ct. App. 2018)?

22 The court does not intend its statement of the question to restrict the Washington
 23 Supreme Court’s consideration of any issue that it may determine is relevant. Should the
 24

1 Washington Supreme Court decide to answer the certified question, it may in its
2 discretion reformulate the question. *See Affiliated FM Ins. Co. v. LTK Consulting Servs.*
3 *Inc.*, 556 F.3d 920, 922 (9th Cir. 2009).

4 The Clerk is DIRECTED to submit to the Washington Supreme Court certified
5 copies of this order, a copy of the docket in the above-captioned matter, and docket
6 numbers 1, 8, 15-22, and 25-27.² The court certifies that these documents contain all
7 matters in the pending case deemed material for consideration of the local law question
8 certified for answer. *See RCW 2.60.010(4)(b)*. The court designates DeepThink as the
9 party who will file the first brief in the Washington Supreme Court on the certified
10 question. *See Wash. Rules App. Proc. 16.16(d)(1)*. The parties are referred
11 to Washington Rule of Appellate Procedure 16.16 for additional information regarding
12 procedures on review of the certified question.

13 **III. CONCLUSION**

14 For the foregoing reasons, the court CERTIFIES the above question to the
15 Washington Supreme Court. The court STAYS this action pending the Washington
16 Supreme Court's final decision on the certified question and DENIES DeepThink's
17 motion for partial summary judgment (Dkt. # 15) on Convoyant's tort and unfair
18 competition claims without prejudice to renewing its motion after the Washington
19 Supreme Court issues its final decision. The parties shall file a joint status report within
20

21 _____
22 ² Docket No. 19-2 is a placeholder for an audio file that was provided to the court on a
thumb drive. (*See* Dkt. # 19-2; *see also* 11/10/21 Min. Entry.) The audio file is not material to
the question being certified and need not be included in the record certified to the Washington
Supreme Court.

1 fourteen days after the Washington Supreme Court issues its final decision.

2 Dated this 3rd day of January, 2022.

3
4


5 JAMES L. ROBART
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22